G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1898-1899

~~19~~ . Mawilla

( )

File No. ~~664~~ 204

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month ~~June 1899~~

SUBJECT.

Passed on the appeal petition of Molegoda and others of Tanivara Village, Hasalaka Pattu Cancelling the Sale to Respondent-Sri of certain lands of the Village and restores to the Villagers for the benefit of the Sri Ariyadhegala Temple of the Village.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

Subsidiaries

(1) Two hrs. Stamps affixed. Stamps defaced
(2) Memo of the Dy-Comr in time
dtd 27-8-97.

BM
6/9/97

1) Appeal against an order of the Dy Comr declaring certain lands (Nos 10, 47, 53 & 22) in the Village of Jamvara not to be Devadaya Inam belonging to the Anjaneya Swamy Temple
2) Council case

The petrs have no special interest in the case beyond their general interest as residents of the Village. The question is whether certain lands, Nos it seems to be one indivisible are Rev dept Inam, viz copy of Parmashe patta of Krishnappa 1865-66) produced by petrs does not show any value after the Settlement, does not show that the lands mentioned therein are Inam

Subd 6 2nd Council
10/9/97

9. Am
9 97.

Call for report with the records of the case

2.9.97

From
14/9/97

Drafted 14/9/97

(1) 1897

No. 633 AS No. 24.
97-98.

Name of Petitioners Mode Gowda and others

Village Jamvara

Taluk Hassan

District Do

Date of Appl 24 — 8 — 97

Date of Receipt 27 — 8 — 97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Three

ABSTRACT.

The petitioners appeal against the order of the Deputy Comr Hassan District dated 27/5/97.

The order is as follows:-

"This day the complainants the villagers who were present before us was heard. No evidence has been produced to prove that the lands in question were Inam lands. If they had been such Inam lands they would not have remained quiet till now. Therefore the sale that has taken place is confirmed."

The petitioners state as follows
Inam Nos 10, 47, 53 & 22
1. Inam lands were granted

the Anjaneya Devaru of the
Gage by the Government. The
ple is in good condition
d the worship of the God is
g performed.

The name of the God is
tered against the Inam
in the Vasul Baki
ounts prepared during the
rvey Settlement. The accounts
in the Taluk Records.

~~One~~ On the dar khast of
Srirangachar the lands were
ied for sale The villag
ected against the sale.
was ordered to be stopped
reply to them several petitio
the Deputy Commr, they
ceived Endorsement No 68
ted 31-8-96 informing them
at orders had been issued
in the matter to the Taluk
The Amildar ordered them
verbally to produce the references
connected with the case. They
btained a copy of the Paimayishi
ccounts of the year Krodhana
rom the Taluk Records, and
produced it.

4. Both in the Pahani and
in the accounts prepared
efore the Survey Settlement,
he name of the Anjaneyadevaru
is entered against the Inam
Lands. These references can
be had both from the Taluk

No. 633

Bangalore Regd
Dt: 27-8-97
Inspector Plant Officer

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD N 6331R
DATE 27-8-97

1. ...

2. ...

3. ...

enjoyment of the temple
on kandyan tenure
Then only can there be
better title than the
Vasal Title according
The Maharaja Suppl
was thereupon requested
to give his opinion from
the point of view of the temple.
The Mahā Sinhalese states
that there is no proof that
the lands were ever drawn
into that as the lands were
now in the enjoyment of
the temple on kandyan tenure,
the sale to Dassanayake
may be cancelled and the
lands restored to the temple to be held
on the usual conditions

11/10/95

Mahā Vidāne

Bangalore Regd.
No. 27-8-97
Insufficient stamp affixed
1

No. 633

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD IN 633 R
DATE 27-8-97

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಮೈಸೂರು ದಿವಾನರವರಿಗೆ

ಮಹಾಶಯರೇ,

ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

1. ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಥಳ ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ವೃತ್ತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳು ಹೀಗಿವೆ — ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪೇಟೆಯ ಸಾಹುಕಾರ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರ ಮಗ ಸಾಹುಕಾರ ಕೃಷ್ಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪೇಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಹುಕಾರಿಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಆಸ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಸಾಹುಕಾರಿಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಆಸ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಸಾಹುಕಾರಿಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಆಸ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

2. ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಥಳ ಹಾಗೂ ಅವರ ವೃತ್ತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳು ಹೀಗಿವೆ — ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪೇಟೆಯ ಸಾಹುಕಾರ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರ ಮಗ ಸಾಹುಕಾರ ಕೃಷ್ಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪೇಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಹುಕಾರಿಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಆಸ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಸಾಹುಕಾರಿಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಆಸ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು ಸಾಹುಕಾರಿಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಆಸ್ತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

3. ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಗತಿಗಳು ಹೀಗಿವೆ —

ಹೆಸರು ಸ್ಥಳ ವೃತ್ತಿ ಆಸ್ತಿ
ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಾಹುಕಾರ ಕೃಷ್ಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಾಹುಕಾರಿಕೆ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್‌ಸಿ/ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ-1/ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಪತ್ರಿಕೆ/2025-26/ದಿನಾಂಕ: 15.03.2026

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲು ವಿಷಾದಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದ ಎಸ್‌ಎಸ್‌ಎಲ್‌ಸಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ-1ರ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಭಾಷೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುದ್ರಣ ದೋಷದಿಂದಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಅಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

2. ಪರಿಷ್ಕೃತ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಅದನ್ನು ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಪರಿಷ್ಕೃತ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯು ದಿನಾಂಕ 22.03.2026ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 10.30 ರಿಂದ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ 1.30ರವರೆಗೆ ನಡೆಯಲಿದೆ.

3. ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಹಾಜರಿರಬೇಕು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅಧೀಕ್ಷಕರು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಧ ಗಂಟೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಮೊಹರನ್ನು ಒಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೂ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಮೊದಲೇ ತೆರೆಯಬಾರದು.

4. ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಬೈಲ್ ಫೋನ್, ಸ್ಮಾರ್ಟ್ ವಾಚ್ ಸೇರಿದಂತೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಾನಿಕ್ ಸಾಧನಗಳನ್ನು ತರಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಇಂತಹ ಸಾಧನಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಪಡಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು ಎಂದು ಎಚ್ಚರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

5. ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಸಿಟಿವಿ ಕಣ್ಗಾವಲು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಚಿತ್ರೀಕರಣವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಿಗೆ ಭದ್ರತೆಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆಗೆ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

6. ಪರೀಕ್ಷಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರು, ಶೌಚಾಲಯ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಥಮ ಚಿಕಿತ್ಸಾ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಯಾವುದೇ ಅನಾರೋಗ್ಯ ಅಥವಾ ತುರ್ತು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಾಯವಾಣಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 1800-425-0123 ಅನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು.

7. ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಫಲಿತಾಂಶವನ್ನು ದಿನಾಂಕ 30.04.2026ರಂದು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಫಲಿತಾಂಶವನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಜಾಲತಾಣ www.sslc-results.karnataka.gov.in ನಲ್ಲಿ ವೀಕ್ಷಿಸಬಹುದು. ಮುದ್ರಿತ ಅಂಕಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಶಾಲೆಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ವಿತರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು.

8. ಈ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಸಂದೇಹಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಬೇಕಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಬಹುದು. ಸಹಾಯವಾಣಿಯು ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯದವರೆಗೂ ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಲಿದೆ.

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 97 [illegible]
27 [illegible]
5 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

೪	ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨
೭	ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨
೬	ನವೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ನವೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ನವೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ನವೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨
೫	ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨	ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ ೨೦೨೨
೪	ಜನವರಿ ೨೦೨೩	ಜನವರಿ ೨೦೨೩	ಜನವರಿ ೨೦೨೩	ಜನವರಿ ೨೦೨೩
೩	ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ೨೦೨೩	ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ೨೦೨೩	ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ೨೦೨೩	ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ೨೦೨೩
೨	ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೦೨೩	ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೦೨೩	ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೦೨೩	ಮಾರ್ಚ್ ೨೦೨೩
೧	ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ೨೦೨೩	ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ೨೦೨೩	ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ೨೦೨೩	ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ೨೦೨೩

೪. ಸಂಘಟನೆಯ ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಿ ---

ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಿ ---

ಸಾಲಿನ ಅಂತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಘದ ಖಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿಯಬೇಕಾದ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಮೊತ್ತವು ಸಂಘದ ಒಟ್ಟು ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವಹಿವಾಟಿನ ಶೇಕಡಾ ೧೦ ರಷ್ಟು ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಮೀರಿರಬಾರದು. ಈ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಮೀರಿದ ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಸಂಘದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಂತೆ ಸಂಘದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಬಳಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಸಂಘದ ಖಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಮೊತ್ತಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮೊತ್ತವಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಘದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಸಮಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಕಾಯ್ದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಸಂಘದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸಂಘದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಂತೆ ಸಂಘದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಬಳಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.

೭. ಸಂಘದ ಲೆಕ್ಕಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಆಯ್ಕೆಯಾದ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಲೆಕ್ಕಪರಿಶೋಧಕರು ಸಂಘದ ಲೆಕ್ಕಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೆ ವರದಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಲೆಕ್ಕಪರಿಶೋಧಕರ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ಲೆಕ್ಕಪರಿಶೋಧಕರ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಘದ ಲೆಕ್ಕಪತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಲು ಸಂಘದ ಪದಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

೯ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಘವನ್ನು ವಿಸರ್ಜಿಸಲು ಸಂಘದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಘದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಮೂರನೇ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಂಘವನ್ನು ವಿಸರ್ಜಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸಂಘವನ್ನು ವಿಸರ್ಜಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಸಂಘದ ಆಸ್ತಿ ಪಾಸ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಘದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಂಚಲಾಗುವುದು.

Pet 1137 (2) 16-9-97

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT. Aug 24 '97

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition,

No. 633 dated 24-8-97

received at the Dewan's Office from the ryots of Javanaya village in the Hassan Taluk appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr. confirming the sale of dam lands Survey 10, 47, 53 and 22 and holding that the said lands are not devadaya dam lands

is forwarded, together with its three enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Hassan District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petition.

2 The petition with its enclosures should be returned.

By order,

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE
16/17-9-1897

15/9/97

M.G C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

2 9/97

Recd 4/10/97

633 of 97 Memo No 4137 & 18-9-97.

4/10/97

Rs fs put up.
submitted with a draft
remarks for approval.
BK
6/10/97

Ah
6/10/97.

12/10/97

1897

No. 85/

Name of Petitioner Malegowda and others

Village Janivara

Taluk Hassan

District do.

Date of Arzi 22 — 9 — 97

Date of Receipt 22 — 9 — 97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

ABSTRACT.

Reminder on their
Letter of 25-8-97,
appealing against the
order of confirmation of
sale passed by the Asst Comr
Hassan in the sale of
certain lands belonging
to the temple of Anjaneya.

R. 25/9/97

No. 851

Report Rept.
22-9-97

References

851 R
22-9-97

1897

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

To The Dy. Commissioner Hassan District

Dated 15th

Despatched 16th October

Received

General No. Pet

No. 520

Enclosure No.

This Office No. Pet-437 dated 6 Septr 1897 calling for report with regard to the petition of Kaale Gowda & others of Janiwara, Hassan Taluk, in regard to the confirmation of sale of certain lands in the said village alleged to be Devara Inam lands

and ~~subsequent reminder marginally noted~~.

Has the honor to draw attention to the above and to request an early reply thereto.

By order,

for ~~Under~~ Secretary.

Gen. Serial No. 30.

(3)

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the
Government ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore,
Revenue and Rev. Departments.
Bangalore.

Dated 15th March 1898

Despatched

Received ✓

Enclosures No. Petn & VP.

General No.

No. 918.

In reply to No. 4379/16/17 September/98

SUBJECT.

Submitting report on the petition from Mudegowda Gowda and others of Javi-vara, Hassan Taluk, appealing against Dy Comr's order confirming the sale of certain lands &c

---

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

Petition No. VC
1897/98

R-3-2000 Ds
-3- 98 Ds
Repd Secretary

9/3/98.
Subd
MJ
9/3/98

The Amildars were given ample to prove that the lands were waste but were unable to do so.

Serial No 19 - which is an extract from the Vasool Baki account - shows that the lands were lying waste at the time of settlement (in 1882) and had been lying waste for 5 or 6 years before settlement. It does not show whether the lands were of first or second quality - the columns for showing this being left blank.

Subd & 2nd Counciller
7/Dec. 98.
Docketed
14/22/4/98 14/4/98
See para 18 of the Report
From 1882 the lands were in the khatah of the temple. If so how did the lands become waste - why were they so treated by the Dept. Apart from the question of the land is there any other reason to be given for the conclusion arrived at that they were the khatah lands of the temple. Mere statement should not be accepted.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

No 918

Dated, Hassan, 15th March 1898.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to official Memorandum No Rt/487, dated 16th September 1897, giving cover to appeal petition No 633, dated 24th August 1897 from Nadè Gowda and others of Janivara village, in the Hassan Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner confirming the sale of certain lands Survey nos 10, 47, 53 and 22 and holding that the said lands are not Devadâya Inam lands, I have the honour to report the facts of the case (viz) as follows:—

2. On 17th November 1893, one Srirangachar of Belur applied to the Amildar of Hassan Taluk for Survey nos 10-22-47 and 53 of the Janivar village and alleged that they were said to be once Inam lands but subsequently treated as Government waste. The darkhast was forwarded to the Shekdar with a notification for sale of the lands as they were included in list B; and the Shekdar was also directed to report if the the lands were once Inam and then treated as Government waste. The Shanbogue endorsed that the lands were Inam till the year Ramathi, when, during the Survey Settlement, they were resumed as the temple was not in good order. He further endorsed that the temple is now in repairs

and

and that puja is now being made and that the villagers have been paying Inâbarmi on these lands

3. On 30th November 1893, the villagers of Jamivar
+ No 9 petitioned† the Amildar of Hassan that the lands might not be given to others on darkhast as the temple would fall to ruins and this petition was sent to the Shekdar for a report if the temple was in good order and what had become of the Inam lands.

+ No 2 4. On 10th December 1893, the Shekdar reported† that there was a combination on the part of the villagers against the sale of the lands and that they therefore refused to estimate their value.

5. On 15th January 1894 the darkhastdar, Srirangpa
+ No 6 Char petitioned† the Amildar stating that the allegations urged by the villagers were false. The Amildar there-
+ No 8 upon observed† that neither the Inam Register nor the Inam Resume Register showed that there was any Inam to the temple and wanted to know under what authority the Shanbogue had endorsed that these lands were once Inam. He further directed the Shekdar to show the lands to him.

6. On 22d January 1894, Mode Gowda (Appellant)
+ No 1 applied† for the Survey Nos in question and prayed that the Khate thereof might be made in the name of
+ No 5 the temple. On the same day the villagers petitioned the Amildar praying that the lands might be made out in the name of the temple. The Amildar thereupo directed the Shekdar to stay sale and return the records. The Shekdar accordingly stayed the sale
No 11 and returned the records with a report† that the lands in question once formed the Inam of the temple

b.o.

but were resumed at the Survey Settlement. He further reported that the temple was since repaired and that one Ubbadane Rangaiya was performing the puja

7. In reply, the Shekdar was informed† that there was no reference to show that these lands were once Inam, and was therefore asked to report if anyone of the villagers was ready to pay the Kandayam of the lands if they are registered in the name of the temple. No 11

The Shekdar submitted the records together with a mutchalika† executed by Patel Mole Gowda (Appellant) that he would pay the Kandayam of the lands if registered in the name of the temple. No 10

The Amildar in his no 1215, dated 22d June 1894, reported† that the lands in question were not entered as Inam in the Inam Register prepared in 1846 nor were they entered in the Resume Register. He recommended that the lands might be registered in the name of the temple Patel Mole Gowda binding himself to pay full assessment—— × No 16

This report of the Amildar was referred to the Thuzroy Assistant Commissioner who directed† (ditto) the Amildar to make a search in the Taluk records for a reference to show that these lands were once Inam and that if no such reference was forthcoming, to dispose of the application under the darkhast rules.

The Amildar accordingly enquired of the Shanbogue who deposed† before him that the lands in question were Government lands No 20

and

and were not registered in the name of the temple as Inam but the Patta whereof stood in the name of the Anjaneya Devaru before the Survey settlement and as they were lying waste, the same were treated as Government waste during the Survey settlement and that since then Kulbanni was being collected from the villagers. He produced an extract from the Vasthaki Accounts prepared in 1882 to show that the lands stood in the name of the Anjanêya Dêvaru. No 19

The Amildar forwarded to the Shekdar on 13th August 1894 a notification for sale of these lands on 22d September 1894. On 28th August 1894, the villagers petitioned the Deputy Commissioner protesting against the sale and he directed the Amildar to send the records staying sale, if the allegations contained in the petition were true. At the sale of the numbers that was held by the Shekdar on 22d September 1894, none came forward to bid for them and the darkhastdar Srirangachar was reported to have gone to Belur. The Amildar in submitting the records recommended that the lands might be given to the temple without auction on full assessment, as the Patta of these lands once stood in the name of the Anjaneya Devaru. No 27 No 28. + No 29

12. The Deputy Commissioner in returning the records to the Amildar asked him to report if the darkhastdar Srirangachar was prepared to pay a sum of Rs 210 which was fixed by the Shekdar as the upset price of these lands in the Havaz patties. As Srirangachar declined to pay the amount fixed by the Shekdar, the Amildar inspected the lands in + (dita)

in person and reported† that the lands were estimated to be worth Rs 70/- in all. He added that some of the villagers present at the time of his inspection expressed their desire to bid for the lands if sold in auction. † No 31.

13. The Deputy Commissioner returned the records to the Amildar with directions† to recommend the restoration of these lands as Inam, if the villagers produced any references to show that they were once Inam lands and if the temple was in repairs; but that if no such reference was forthcoming in the Taluk, even after a research the lands might be resold after communicating the same to the villagers † No 33

14. The villagers were served with a notice† to produce the reference but as they failed so to do, the lands were advertized for sale on 5th September 1895. On 20th August 1895, the villagers petitioned† the late Mr Krishnaswamaiyangar who directed the Amildar to stay sale and submit the records. † No 32 † No 37

15. On 12th September 1895, the Amildar returned the records staying sale as directed and reiterated† the statements contained in his former reports. † No

16. On 27th January 1896 Mr J. W. Knight, as In-charge for Deputy Commissioner, directed† the Amildar to ask the villagers to produce any reference they may have to show that the lands were Inam but if they failed to do so to sell them by auction taking the amount estimated by the Panchayatdars as upset price. † No 3

17. The villagers did not produce any reference but only urged that the lands should be given to their temple.

18. The Amildar thereupon directed the Shekdar to hold the sale on 10th August 1896. As there were heavy showers on the 10th August, the Shekdar adjourned the sale to the 12th idem intimating the same to the persons present. The Shekdar held the sales of the following Survey nos and the amounts of bids are:

Survey no	Extent	Amount of bid	Highest bidder
10	2-9 (Dry)	25	Srirangachar
22	1-31 (Wet)	61	
47	3-4 (Dry)	16	
53	1-28 (Dry)	10	

On the auction list (Haraj Patti) of each of these numbers there is a remark that persons residing in other villages, who were present at the time of sale, refused to sign their names.

No. 52. 19. On 1st September 1896, the villagers petitioned† the Amildar that the accounts of the year Khodham might be referred to as they showed that the temple possessed Inam lands. The Amildar gave them 10 days' time to produce the reference, but they failed to do so. The Amildar therefore, on 30th September, 1896, submitted† the records for confirmation of the sale to the General Duty Assistant Commissioner, who was placed in charge of the Taluk. The latter officer required the Amildar to produce the records at the time of Jamabandi.

† No. 54.

20. The villagers petitioned† to me on 7th November 1896 protesting against the sale and I sent it to the Amildar for disposal along with the records

† No. 55

Comm[illegible]

with the case. On 12th November 1896, the villagers presented to the Amildar a copy of the Pagimayishi† Patti of the year Knodhana (1805-1806) as showing that the temple had Inam lands. This reference does not show that the lands in question were Inam nor does it show that any other specified land was Inam. † No 57.

21. Srirangachar, darkhastdar and auction purchaser, urged† for the Saguvali chit and it was referred to the Amildar for disposal or report with records. † Nos 60 & 61

22. The Amildar placed the records before Mr Paramasivaiyer on 10th April 1897, who required† the Amildar to enquire of the villagers if they would agree to pay the Kandayam of these lands, and also to enquire of Srirangachar if he would agree to give up the lands if they are registered in the name of the temple. The villagers deposed before the Jamabandy officer agreeing to pay the Kandayam. † No 58

23. The Amildar submitted† the records as required in my order No 228, dated 7th April 1897. The presence of the parties and the Shanbogue before me was summoned on the 24th May 1897. The villagers came before me and the darkhastdar Srirangachar was reported to be absent at Belur. After hearing those present, I recorded an order as follows:† † No 64.

† No 65

"I have heard the villagers in person. They have no evidence to show that the land was ever a temple Inam. If the same was

such

such Inam - they would not kept quiet without securing the same these many years. As the lands have been regularly sold and purchased for Rs. 112/- the sale is confirmed."

This order is now under appeal.

24. The petition with its enclosures, received with the memo under reference, is herewith returned.

25. The vernacular papers connected with the case, ending with Hassan Amildar's report No 854, dated 10th December 1897, are herewith submitted for needful reference and obliging return.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

(4) 1898

From

The Secretary to Govt
Genl and Rev. Depts

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan Dt

Dated 25-4

Despatched 26 April/98.

Received

General No. 10177 P

P. No. 1323

Enclosure No.

The Dy Comrs letter No 918 dated 15th March 1898, reporting on the petn of Mallegowda and others of Jaminara village in the Hassan Taluk, regarding the sale of Estate lands.

In returning the papers received with the above for reference and resubmission, has the honor to observe that in para 10 of the Dy Comrs report this stated that these lands were in the khata of the temple in the

25-4-98 (BK-2)

year 1882. If so how did the lands become waste and why were they so treated by the Survey Dept.[2] Apart from the question of the land sharing there seems to be some foundation for the contention that they were the khata lands of the temple. The Dy Comr is requested to further elucidate this point and submit a detailed report in the matter

By order

C2
21.4.22

for Secretary

23/4/22

Repeal

30/6/98

25-8-97 No Rh 5-20 & 15-10-97

MR
1/7/98 Reps were put up for rgl
No: 9185/684 from D.C. Hassan
letter No: 1239 & 14-6-98. cir re
the sale of certain lands, and
submitted to the 2d Council on on 30-6-98

AK
2/7/98

1323.
1898

No. 3076

Name of Petitioners Mallegowda & others

Village Janivar (Bilahalli) Ho

Taluk Hassan

District

Date of Arzi 23-6-98

Date of Receipt 27-6-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2 nil

ABSTRACT

Reminder of Mem Pet^rs & 25-8-97 + 22-9-97 regarding the inam attached to Anjaneya temple in the above village.

Pray that the inam may be confirmed.

29/6/98

3076

3076R
27-6-58

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible]
2 [illegible]
3 [illegible]
4 [illegible]
5 [illegible]

1898 Rev Deptt
Genl No 9185
Pet 684

From

The Dy Commissioner
Hassan Dist

To

The Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore
Genl & Rev Deptt

Dated 14 June 1898

Despatched

Received

General No. 1239
No.

Enclosure No. V.P.

Reporting in reply to this Office
No 10177 of 26 April 1898
Pet 1323
that all the available facts
in connection with the petition
of Mole Gowda & Others of
Janivara village Hassan
Taluk, have been reported
in his No 918 of 15-3-98 & that
beyond what is stated there
there seems to be no chance
of any more facts forthcoming
that no authoritative document
beyond 'Vasul Baki' account
of 1882 Exists to support the
fact that the lands S Nos 10-22
1783 were in the Khata of
Hanumentarayaswami
of the

Councillor's order

Does the Municipal Deptt
wish to say anything
in this matter and in the
interest of the Amaneya
temple. The file may be
sent to him

(Sd) BNK
3-7-98

P.

Pet 25/7/98

Transferred in original
with the whole file for
favor of remarks and
opinion.

'By order'
(Sd) VR Thyagaraja
Secy

July/98

'Copy'

[illegible]
-7-98

31.]



189

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

To

The Secretary to the
Govt ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.
Rev. and Rev. Departments.

Dated 14 June 1898.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures—No. Nil.

General No. 1239.
No.

His No 10177, dated 26th April 1898, calling for further particulars regarding the petition of Mole Gowda and others of Ennivara village in the Hassan Taluk, about the sale of certain lands.

Has the honour to State that all the available facts connected with the case have been reported in this office letter No 918 dated 15th March 1898. Beyond what has been stated therein, there seems no chance of any more facts forthcoming. The lands in question bearing Survey Nos 10-22-47-53 were stated to have been in the Khata of Sta ru mantaraya Swami. No authoritative public document except the 'Inam Book' accom-

Petition No. VI
16/6/98
Reps putup
16/98 Subd to 2nd com with
rep. with ref to order on previous
16/98 rep wh
30/6/98
7.20 pm
.6.98
Does the mozra
Subramanya
payment
in this matter
on the interest
of the Anjaneya
Temple -? Mrs
Temple may be sent
No 9 file may be sent
7/98 herein
3.7.98
No 684 dated 5/7/98
Transferred in original with
the whole file for. favour of
remarks & return
By with
4/7/98
7-7

year 1882. exists in support of this fact: No assessment, the Maji No 8 is noted in the account. Nor is there any record to show that the lands were Inam attached to the temple. During the five or six years previous to the Survey Settlement, the lands were stated to have been lying waste, owing, as is alleged, to the temple having fallen into a dilapidated condition and the puja or worship of the diety having been stopped. At the Settlement, however, the lands which were said to have been waste, were treated as Government Banzar and entered in the Faisal Patrika. Why the lands became waste and why the Survey Department treated them as Government Banzar is not ascertainable. As the lands were not Inam and no assessment was paid for the same they were evidently taken for having been clandestinely enjoyed by the villagers of Jamivar village with the Connivance and Conjunction with the village officials.

4. Vernacular records, received with the above, are here with submitted.

Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

(7)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
No. 2106
SEP 20 1898
No. 135
VAN'S OFFICE

From The Amildar Supdt. & Inspector

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Genl & Rev Dept.

Dated 17/9/98

Despatched

Received

General No. 374
No.

Enclosure No. on file

Expressing opinion on the subject of the sale by public auction of certain Inam lands in Janivara village in Hassan Dk

Recd 21/9.

References to be marked.

23 5 2 Coms
BRJS
22-9-98
Refer for report Subdt
AK 22/9/98 23/9/98 MK

Put up 2nd Comrs with a note of the petr
by 1/10/98
Letter sent in the usual course
Recd 17.10.98
14/11/98

Petition No 19/9/98

Inamdar Superintendent's Office.

No. 374 Enc 1 file Dated Bangalore 14th September 1898

From,

The Inamdar Superintendent

in Mysore.

To,

The Secretary to the

Government of Mysore

General and Revenue Departments

Sir,

Adverting to your No. 6 Petn dated 5th July 1898, forwarding for expression of my opinion, the file of papers relating to the petition of Molegowda and others of Janivara village in Hassan Taluk, stating that certain Inam lands belonging to the Hanumantharayaswami temple in the village have been sold by

public

public auction to one Belur Singlachar and praying that the sale might be cancelled and the lands restored as Inam to the Temple, I have the honor to state that I have carefully perused the entire records in the case and also examined the Inam Registers; I find no entries in the Government accounts or other evidence to shew that the lands in question were ever held on Inam tenure by the Temple. But, on the contrary, the Survey Vasul Baki Statement of 1882 (Serial No 19 filed in the vernacular records) points to the fact that these lands were then held by the Temple on Kandayem tenure, the temple therein being described as Khate'dar of the lands, and that since, the

lands

lands have lain waste and been treated as Government Banjar.

2. Considering that the villagers have been most eagerly and persistently contending since 1893 to secure the lands for the temple, which is locally an important one, I would recommend that the sale of the lands to Singlachar be cancelled and that the lands be registered in the name of the temple on Kandayem tenure on condition of the villagers themselves paying the assessment thereon and applying the proceeds for the exclusive benefit of the temple, as agreed to by them in their statement made before the Jamabandi Officer on the 13th April 1897.

Enclosure No. 59.

3. The papers received with the communication under

xc/h.E

reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

G Stewart

Mineral Superintendent.

MV

9.1.99

10/11/99

18-1-99

8-1-99

20.1.99

295

17/11/99

ನೋಟೀಸ್

ಹುಜೂರ್ ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂ ..

189..7 9..ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯು ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರು 24

ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿಗಳು ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

[illegible]

ವಿಷಯ.

[illegible]

ಮೇಲೆ ಕಂಡ ಅಪೀಲುವಾದಿ [illegible] ಗೆ.

ನೀವು [illegible] ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರವರ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿದ 189 7 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಅಗಷ್ಟ ಮಾಹೆ 24 ನೇ ಮರಕುಮಿನ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯು, 1899 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಫೆಬ್ರುವರಿ 6 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡುವದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಆ ದಿವಸ ಪೂರ್ವಾಹ್ಣ 11 ಘಂಟೆ ಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗ ಬೇಕು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 6 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ [illegible] 1899

ನೇ ಇಸವಿ, ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಮು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

For Revenue Secretary.

ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿದಾಗ ಅವರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಜಗಳವಾಡಿದ್ದು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಿಂದ ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆರೋಪಿಯು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸೇವಕರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆಂದು ಸಾಬೀತಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆರೋಪಿಯನ್ನು ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಗುರಿಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆರೋಪಿಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನು?

ಆರೋಪಿ — ನಾನು ಬಡವನಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಾರಿಗೆ ಕ್ಷಮಿಸಿ ಬಿಡಬೇಕು.

ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಕುರಿತು ಆರೋಪಿಯ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕಿದೆಯೇ?

ಆರೋಪಿಯ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರು — ಆರೋಪಿಯು ಬಡವನಿದ್ದು ಕುಟುಂಬದ ಏಕೈಕ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ವಿಧಿಸಬೇಕು.

16/1/97

ನಂಬರ ೨೯೭
103

ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾಣ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲೆದಾರ್ರಿಗೆ ಬರಸಿ

ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿರೂಪ ಅದಾಗಿ—

ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಸೆಕ್ 189 7—98 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಪೀಲ್ 24 ನೇ ನಂಬರು ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯು ಕಛೇರಿಗಾರರು ಮಾರ್ಜಿನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾವವರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಲೊರಾದ ೨ ಕಲ್ಕತ್ತಾ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು. ಇದರ ಹಮುರಹಾ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಕ,ಮು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಅಸಲ್ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ್ಲೆ ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ವಾಪಸು ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 6 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಮೇ 1899 ನೇ

ಇಗವಿ, ದರಜಾಗಾ ಬೆಂ ಸಿ ಕಛೇರಿ

By Order,

for Secretary.

24
97-98



ಹುಜೂರ್ ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

1897—98 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯು ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರು... 24

ಅಪೀಲು ವಾದಿಗಳು—

ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

ವಿಷಯ

ಮೇಲೆ ಕಂಡ ಅಪೀಲುವಾದಿ ಗೆ

ನೀವು ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರವರ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿದ 1897 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಸಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ಮಾಹೆ 24 ನೇ ಮುಕುಮಿನ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯು, 1897 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಫೆಬ್ರುವರಿ 13 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆಯಾಲ ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಡುವುದರಿಂದ, ಆ ದಿವಸ ಪೂರ್ವಾಹ್ನ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀವು ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 26 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಜನವರಿ 1898

ಈ ಇಸವಿ, ಮೊಕ್ಕಾಂ ಬೆಳಗಾಲ

By Order,

Revenue Secretary.

ਸਾਰਥਕ ਵਾਕ ਬਣਾਉਣ ਲਈ ਸ਼ਬਦਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਹੀ ਕ੍ਰਮ ਵਿਚ ਲਿਖੋ।

ਮੈਂ ਜਾਵਾਂਗਾ ਕੱਲ੍ਹ ਨੂੰ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿਚ

ਦਸ ਦੇ ਸਿਫ਼ਰ ਅਤੇ ਦਸ ਨੂੰ ਜੋੜਨ ਤੇ ਕੀ ਜੋੜ ਆਉਂਦਾ ਹੈ?

ਵੀਹ

ਸਮਾਂ — ੭ — ਵੀਹ

OF THE DEWAN O
JAN 23 1899

ನಂಬರ್ 121

1336

21.1.99 ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್ರಿಗೆ ಬರಸಿ

ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿರೂಪ ಅದಾಗಿ—

ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಸನ 1897 —98 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಪೀಲ್ 24 ನೇ ನಂಬರು ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯ ಕಕ್ಷಿಗಾರರು ಮಾರ್ಜಿನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾದವರ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಯಾರಾದ ೨ ಕಾಪಿ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಇದರ ಹಮುರಹಾ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಕ್ರಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಅಸಲ್ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನ ಕೂಡ್ಲೆ ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ವಾಪಸ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 25 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ 1 1899 ನೇ

ಇಸವಿ, ದರಜಾಗಾ. Bangalore

By Order,

for Secretary.

Bkm

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]



ಹುಜೂರ್ ದಿವಾನ್ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

1897.—98.ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯು ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರು ..24.....*..

ಅಪೀಲು ಪಾದಿಗಳು

ಹಂಸಗರ್ಕಾಂಲ್ಲ್ಲಾಕ್ಷಪ್ಪ ಪ್ಪಗೌಲಹಳ್ಳಿಸಕ್ಕುಗಳು
ಪಟೇಪಾಲಕ್ಕಾ ರುಸ್ತುಗಾದ ಕೆಂಪೇಗೌಡ
ಸಕ್ಕೆರೆಹಳ್ಳಿ

ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ

ಪಟೇಲು ಬೂಕಾಳು ತೆಸವಂದ್ರಹಳ್ಳಿಯವರು
ಸ್ಟಾ- ನೈ ಕಚೇರಿವಾಸಿ ಕೆ

ವಿಷಯ.

ತೆಲುಂಕೆರೆ ಪಟೇಲುಕಾಳು ಪಟೇಪಾಲಕ್ಕಾರುದ ಸನದ ಕೆ, 47, 53 ನೇಯಿಸ್ಟು 22
ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಪಟೇಲುಕಾಳು ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ

ಮೇಲಕಾಂಡ ಅಪೀಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಸ್ಟಾ- ನೈ ಕಚೇರಿವಾಸಿ ಗೆ

ಅಪೀಲು ನಾದಿ ಕೆಂಪೇಗೌಡ ಸಕ್ಕೆರೆಹಳ್ಳಿ ನು

ಹಂಸಗ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟು ಡೆಪ್ಯೂಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರವರ ಹುಕುಮಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ದಾಖಲುಮಾಡಿ ಇರುವ
ಅಪೀಲಾನು 1894 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಫೈಲ್ಡು ಎಕ 13 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿವಸ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಾಗಿ
ವೊಕ್ಕಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ನಡೆಸಲ್ಪಡುವದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಆ ದಿವಸ ಪೂರ್ವಾಹ್ನ 11 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ನೀನು ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ
ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಜು 25 ನೇ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು — 1897 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ,

ವೊಕ್ಕಾಂ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಾಯಿತು

By Order,

for Secretary.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೃಪೋ/ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ/ 1

ಶಾಸಕರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಧಾನಸಭಾ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ

ಉತ್ತರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಉತ್ತರಿಸುವ ಸಚಿವರು

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ

ಉತ್ತರ

ಪೂರಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು

ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಸಚಿವರ ಸಹಿ

878

THE DEWAN'S OFFICE JAN. 13 1898

ನಂಬರ 122

ಮಿ 5468

ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾನ್ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ದಾರ್ರಿಗೆ ಬರಸಿ

ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿರೂಪ ಅದಾಗಿ—

ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಸನ್ 1897—98 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಆಪೀಲ್ 24 ನೇ ನಂಬರು ನೊಕದ್ದನೆಯ ಕಛೇರಿಗಾರರು ಮಾರ್ಜಿನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿರುವ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತದೂರಾದ 1 ಕ್ಕೆ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಇದರ ಹಮರಹಾ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ಕಮಮ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಿಂದ ಅಸಲ್ ನೋಟೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ್ಲೆ ಈ ಆಫೀಸಿಗೆ ವಾಪಸ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 25 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ 2 1898 ನೇ

ಇಸವಿ, ದರಜಾಗಾ

By Order,

Secretary.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. NO. 1315
DATE 6-2-99

24

31-1-99

ಸನ್ 1897-98ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಪೌರಸಭೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ
ಸಂಬಳಗಳು

ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಹೆಸರು — ಅವರ ಕೆಲಸ

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಪಿಳ್ಳೈ, ಬಿ.ಎ., ಬಿ.ಎಲ್. — ಪೌರಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ

1. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಸಂಬಳವು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು. ಅವರು 10-22-47ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಹುದ್ದೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಅಧಿಕಾರವು ಪೌರಸಭೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳ ಮೇಲೂ ಇದೆ.

2. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯು ಪ್ರತಿ ತಿಂಗಳ ಮೊದಲ ವಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಗೆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಆ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಿನ ತಿಂಗಳ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳ ವಿವರಗಳು ಇರಬೇಕು.

3. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯು ಪೌರಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಭೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದು, ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದ್ದಾಗ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಬೇಕು.

4. ಕಂಪೌಂಡಿಂಗ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಔಷಧಿಗಳ ಲೆಕ್ಕವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿ ತಿಂಗಳೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು.

[illegible]

[illegible] 112-0-0 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 21-6-97

[illegible] 96-97 [illegible]

[illegible] 15-15 [illegible]

[illegible]

ದಿಲಿಂದಸಿಲಂಡದಶಿಕ್ಷಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಂದ್ಲಾಲಂಡಲಾ
ಶ್ವಾಲಿತಶಿಕ್ಷಕಂಗಳ ಆಗಿಲಲ್ಲದೆ —
6 ಅವಿಲಂಕ್ಕೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷಕಂದಿರುಮಕ್ಕಳಿಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಷ್ಟು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ
ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಲಲಂಗಿಲಂಗಳಂದ್ಲಾದಾದನೆರವೇರಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು
ಸಾಲದೆಂದು- ಇಂತಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಕಂಗಳ ಅಂತಿಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ
ಸಂಗತಿಗಳನ್ನಳ್ಳಲಾದಲಾಲದೆ ಅಲ್ಲ —
10 ಲಾಲಿಲ್ಲಂದ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ್ಲಾಲಂ- ಎಲ್ಲ
ಶಿಕ್ಷಣಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದು ತೊಲಗಿಬಲಾಲಲ
ತರಗತಿಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಂಬಂದ್ಲಾದಾದ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ್ಲಲ
ವಿಲ್ಲಂದ ಅವಿಲಂಕಿಂದಿಗ್ಲೆ ನಿಗದ್ಧಿತವಾದ ತರಗತಿ
ರಾಂಶವನ್ನ ನಲಾಂಗುಂಡಲ್ಲ ಆ ಶಿಕ್ಷಕಿಯಿಂದಿಲು
ತನ್ನ ಲಂ ಅವಿಲಂಗಿಲಂಗಳಂದ್ಲಾದಾದ ಅಚ್ಚರಿಸ್ಲೆ
ಅವಿಲಂಕಿಂದಿಗಳಿಂದ್ಲಾಲಂದ್ಲಾಲಂದ್ಲಾಲಂದ್ಲಾಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಿಲಂ
ನಲಿಯನಾಗಿಲ್ಲಾಗಿ ಆ ಶಿಕ್ಷಕಿಯಿಂದಿಲಲಂ
ಲಲ್ಲಿಲಿಗಿಲಂ ತಿಲ್ಲಲ್ಲ —
31-1-99

ನಂ. ಶಿಕ್ಷಕಿಯಿಂದಿಲಲಂ
ಶಲಲಂ —

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 24 of 1897-98.

Appellants.	Vs.	Respondent.
Mole Gauda & others		Srirangachar

Subject:— Claim to lands S. Nos 10, 22, 47 & 53 of Jeniwara, Hassan Taluk, as Devadayem Inam lands.

Entered in the Mut Reg.
Subd & Asst Commissr
23/1/99.

The lands were not Inam at settlement treated as thereon Sale now regular - Can it be cancelled now as supposed Umgen settle?

23/1/99

Mole Gauda present
10/2/99.



(9)

Note of the Sub' of Mysore

Appellts vs Respts
Mole Gowda & others Srivangadha

Draft for appt
Sub' & 1st Comatter
(This is the last of the drafts in the cases heard on 17/2/99. 5 cases have been ast[d] & on one records were sub' & 2nd C[r])
25/2/99.

Read
(1) Petn no 633/A24 of 1897-98 from Mole Gowda & others of the village of Jamvara Hassan Taluk appealing against the Dy Comm[r]'s order confirming the sale of S[rvy] nos 10, 22, 47, 45-3 of the said village & the respt

(2). ~~Letter no~~ Correspondence ending with docket no 1239 dt 14/6/98 from the Dy Comm[r] Hassan dt

(3) Letter no 374 dt 17/9/98 from the Huzarayi Supt in Mysore

The respt having applied on 17/11/97 for the lands in Chenkan wh were ring waste

[illegible] 35
Thanks.
I will thank the asst Secy when a list prepared showing Nos of appeals heard & disposed of by me during Oct[r] Nov[r] & Dec[r] 98 up to date and the Nos of appeals pending
25/2/99

1/2/99

the ann^r directed their sale
by public auction. Before
the sale the villagers petitioned
the ann^r on 30/11/93 & again
on 22/1/94 protesting against
the sale & representing that
lands were once the main
lands of the village Anganeya
Devann. and that at least
the Khate thereof sh^d be made
in the name of the temple.
on 5/4/94 Mr Sowda
one of the appellants executed
a muchalika that he would
pay the assessment of the
lands if registered in the
name of the temple. The ann^r
reported to the Dy Com^r on 22/6/94
that there was no proof
that the lands were ever Devann
but recommended in consideration
of the villagers' ~~petitions~~
representations that the
lands might be granted to
the temple on assessment.

The Nazarayi Asst Com^r
to whom the report was referred

directed a further enquiry
as to whether the lands
were ever drawn & the sale
of the lands if no proof
to that effect were produced
In the enquiry that followed
the Shanbog produced on 4/8/96
the Vasul Baki Sheet of
1882 showing that the
temple was the Khatedar
of the lands before Survey
Settlement & that they were
resumed & Sanct at the Settlement
The Amv thereupon directed
the sale of the lands on 22/9/96
but the sale was stayed by
order of the Dy Comv to whom
the Village Complainer
This State of things
Continued till on 12/8/96
the lands were sold by
public auction & Knocked
Down to the respt
The Sent Amt Comv
to whom the records were
sent for information

Sale reserved the matter for
disposal at the Jamabundi
The Villagers meanwhile
produced a copy of the
Dharmapith i patta of
Krodhana (1805-6) showing
that the temple held inam
lands but throwing no light
as to whether the lands in
Question were inam -
On the complaint of the
Villagers the Dy Comm^r
Called for the records &
passed an order on 27/5/97
declaring that the lands were
never inam & confirming
the sale to the resp^ts
Hence the present appeal
by Govt.
The Govt Pleader in opening
the Govt case contends
that as the lands were once
in the enjoyment of
the temple on Kandayam
tenure the sale to the
resp^ts may be cancelled
& the lands restored to the temple

6474-82
No. P.F. 64-98 § 15.3.99. order thereon

At the time of the
Survey settlement the land
in Survey No. 64 were entered
in the Vasul Baki Regr in the
name of the temple
It is true there is no
evidence of encroachment
but the Sur settlement
ought to have been in
favour of the temple
as it's private property
if, as is now the case, the
Patel & other villagers
~~have~~ had ? come
forward to pay the
Govt Kandayam —
The sale of the land
was made without
proper enquiry & without
giving the villagers the
opportunity of ~~of~~ proving
& pay the assessment

due to fall under these
circumstances the sale
will be set aside & the
purchase money refunded
to the Respt- Sriranjachar
& the lands restored to
the Villagers in accordance
with their Muchalika
of 5/4/94, the Patteh temp, from time there
made out in the names of the Patel & other
principal ryots with the consent & the knowledge
of the Muchalika by for the benefit of the temple.

Lee
25/2/99

To Dy Com^r Hassan &
with records

To AC & Supt

& The Dy Commrs after
orders

Passed
in evidence
on behalf
of the
Petitioner
25/2/99

X Advt to 2nd Counsel

Rd 27.2.99

27/2/99

+ 23-3-99
16-3-99

Rd
9.3.99

ಚಿತ್ರ-ಚಿತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು

ಚಿತ್ರ-ಚಿತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ೧೨೦ ಚಿತ್ರಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಂಪಾದಕರ ಮಾತು

ಈ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ೧೨೦ ಚಿತ್ರಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಂಪಾದಕರು

ಸಂಪಾದಕರ ಮಾತು

ಈ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ೧೨೦ ಚಿತ್ರಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು ಅಪರೂಪದವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಬಹಳ ಶ್ರಮವಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore, Petition, dated 15th March 1899.

Appellants.		*Respondent.*
Molegauda and others.	*vs.*	Srirangachar.

READ —

(1) Petition No. 633—A. 24 of 1897-98, from Molegauda and others of the village of Janivara, Hassan taluk, appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order confirming the sale of S. Nos. 10, 22, 47 and 53 of the said village to the respondent.

(2) Correspondence ending with docket No. 1239, dated 14th June 1898, from the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan district.

(3) Letter No. 374, dated 17th September 1898, from the Muzrai Superintendent in Mysore.

The respondent having applied on 17th November 1893 for the lands in question which were lying waste, the Amildar directed their sale by public auction. Before the sale, the villagers petitioned the Amildar, on 30th November 1893 and again on 22nd January 1894, protesting against the sale and representing that the lands were once the inam lands of the village Anjaneyadevaru, and that at least the khate thereof should be made in the name of the temple. On 5th April 1894, Molegauda, one of the appellants, executed a muchalika that he would pay the assessment of the lands if registered in the name of the temple. The Amildar reported to the Deputy Commissioner, on 22nd June 1894, that there was no proof that the lands were ever inam, but recommended, in consideration of the villagers' representations, that the lands might be granted to the temple on assessment. The Muzrai Assistant Commissioner, to whom the report was referred, directed a further enquiry as to whether the lands were ever inam and the sale of the lands if no proof to that effect were forthcoming. In the enquiry that followed, the shanbhog produced, on 4th August 1894, the Vasul Baki Account of 1882, showing that the temple was the khatadar of the lands before survey settlement, and that they were resumed to Government at the settlement. The Amildar thereupon directed the sale of the lands on 22nd September 1894, but the sale was stayed by order of the Deputy Commissioner, to whom the villagers complained. This state of things continued till, on 12th August 1896, the lands were sold by public auction and knocked down to the respondent. The General Assistant Commissioner, to whom the records were submitted for confirmation of sale, reserved the matter for disposal at the jamabandi. The villagers meanwhile produced a copy of the Paimaishi patti of Krodhana (1805-6) showing that the temple had inam lands, but throwing no light as to whether the lands in question were inam. On the complaint of the villagers, the Deputy Commissioner called for the records and passed an order, dated 27th May 1897, deciding that the lands were never inam and confirming the sale to the respondent. Hence the present appeal to Government.

2. The Muzrai Superintendent is of opinion that, as the lands were once in the enjoyment of the temple on kandayam tenure, the sale to the respondent may be cancelled and the lands restored to the temple.

No. 6474-82—PET. F. 64-98, DATED BANGALORE, 15TH MARCH 1899.

ORDER THEREON.—At the time of the survey settlement, the lands in question were entered in the Vasul Baki Register in the name of the temple. It is true there is no evidence of inam grant, but the survey settlement ought to have been in favor of the temple as its private property, if, as is now the case, the patel and other villagers had come forward to pay the Government kandayam. The sale of the lands was made without proper enquiry and without giving the villagers the opportunity of offering to pay the assessment due to Government. Under these circumstances the sale will be set aside and the purchase money refunded to the respondent Srirangachar and the lands restored to the villagers in accordance with their muchalika, dated 5th April 1894, the patta being, from time to time, made out in the name of the patel or other principal raiyat, with the consent of the executants of the muchalika, for the benefit of the temple.

C SREENIVASIENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District, with vernacular records.
The Muzrai Superintendent.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts.

Exd.—H.A.P.

(9)

1898-99

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 15th March 1899

No. $\frac{647}{\text{Pet. F.}}$

Passing orders on the appeal of Molegauda and others of Janivara, Hassan taluk, cancelling the sale to respondent Srirangachar of certain lands of the village, and restoring them to the villagers for the benefit of the Anjaneyaswami temple of the village.

SBP—23-3-99—200

Re/ce
.b.gs

33 of 97-6474
P-7864-98 10-3-99

3) b.gs
5-6 The above file relating to the Lady ent is put up —

AK
15/6/99

Sub'
1/ One Rupee stamp affixed- stamp cancelled

2/ Application for a review of G.O. No. 6474-82 / 97 64-98 dt 15 March 99 - (Entire) by the Respondent.

nil
7.6.99
Sub[d] to 2nd councillor 18/6/99

Rs 7 nil
22.6.99

Decline to open
Mrs case
Illegible
23 6 99

Illegible

1899

No. 1945

Name of Petitioner N. Srirangachar

Village / Taluk: Belur

District Hassan

Date of Arzi 6-6-99.

Date of Receipt 10-6-99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

appt. Respondent-
Mole Gowda of Mes of Janivarasa Kalle, Hassan Dt. ABSTRACT
Srirangachar of Belur.

This is an application for review of Govt order No 633 dt 14-3-99 passed in case, No. 24 of 1897-98, on the following grounds:—

Pr[d] 6474-82 / 97 64

1. That if the land in dispute had stood in the name of the deity before the Survey Settlement & after the Settlement, if the villagers had agreed to pay the kandaya it would not have been

d as a Govt waste land;
2. There is no evidence ~~to~~ forth-
-coming from the records to
shew that Govt did not give
an opportunity for ~~permit~~ the villagers to pay
the kandayam of the land,
3. that they were paying Melvaram
to the land just as they were
paying Melvaram to any other
land in the village,
4 that if the land had really
belonged to the temple, it
would not have been left
uncultivated & the temple
would not have been left
to fall into ruins, without
performing puja to the
~~temple~~ deity of the villagers.
would not have stated before
the Govt that if the land
were to be sold they would
bid very high for it. (The
present price is much higher
than its actual price).
5 that the applts have
agreed to pay the kandayam
because they may use it
for grazing their cattle &
which they cannot do if

the land were in the possession of the respdts (Rebts)

6. that the Rebts has paid Rs112 for the land (sale price) & the Kanoogam for it for the year Durmukhi, though he reaped no crop in it, as the Sagavali Chit was granted to him 10 months after the sale on 21-6-97, & afterwards he has spent Rs 200 on it, to make it fit for cultivation.

7. that the Rebts is prepared to give a Muchalika to Govt stating that he would always keep the temple in good order & carry on the worship of the diety regularly out of the money from his own pocket, if the land were given to him.

Prays that the disputed ~~above~~ lands may be given

to him on the above
condition or that the
money spent by him
on the land (price 112 + kandayam 13=15-- + repairs 200)
& the the interest on the sum
from 26-8-96 may be
given to him either from
the ryots or from Govt.

Enc 1. Govt order
No 633 dt 14-3-99.

sm
13/4/99.

One Rupee stamp affixed

1945

1945R
10-6-28

24

1897-98

(1)

(2)

(3)

[illegible]

(೪) [illegible]

(೫) [illegible]

(೬) [illegible] 26-8-96 [illegible] (84-0-0) 12-8-96 [illegible] (28-0-0) [illegible] (112-0-0) [illegible] 1896-97 [illegible]

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಪಿ 1945-ಪಿ(II) 28.4.99

ಸಂಪುಟ ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಯ

ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸದರಿ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ಯಾರಾ 4(ii)ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂತ
ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಲು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿತ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ
ಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು
ಸೂಚಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 10.22.47 ದಿನಾಂಕ 5-3-
ಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರವಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು
ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ, ಸಂಪುಟ ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಯವರಿಗೆ
ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ
ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ
ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ
ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು
ಕರೆಯಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿದ
ನಂತರ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪುಟ ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸಂಪುಟ ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪುಟದ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿ
ಸಂಪುಟದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದಂತೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು.
ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಲು
ಕೋರಿ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು
ಕರೆಯಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿದ
ನಂತರ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪುಟ ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸಂಪುಟ ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪುಟದ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿ
ಸಂಪುಟದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದಂತೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು.
ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಲು
ಕೋರಿ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು
ಕರೆಯಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿದ
ನಂತರ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪುಟ ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸಂಪುಟ ಉಪಸಮಿತಿಯ
ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪುಟದ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿ
ಸಂಪುಟದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದಂತೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಕೋರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

By order

for Secretary

ಕಸ್ಟ.
26.6.99